

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Subject to the approval of the Examiner, Applicant proposes to amend Figs. 1-3 by labeling each "Prior Art." The changes to Figs. 1-3 are indicated on the attached drawing Replacement Sheets 1/2 and 2/2 attached hereto.

Attachments: Drawing Replacement Sheets 1/2 and 2/2

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-25 remain pending, of which claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 21-25 are presented for examination. Applicant has amended the title; amended Figures 1-3; amended claims 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8; and added claims 21-25.

In the Office Action mailed on November 18, 2005, the Examiner required a new title; objected to Figures 1-3 and requested that each be labeled "Prior Art"; objected to claims 4 and 5 because of informalities; rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Masato (JP 2000-260952) ("*Masato*"); rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masato in view of Hokazono et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,545,317) ("*Hokazono*"); and objected to claims 4 and 8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

First, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4 and 8. Applicant respectfully traverses the objections and rejections described above.¹ However, to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended the title, drawings, and claims to place the application in condition for allowance.

Amendment to the Specification

In response to the Examiner's requirement of a new title, Applicant has amended the title to read "SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE HAVING ELEVATED SOURCE/DRAIN ON

¹ The Office Action may contain statements characterizing the related art, case law, and claims. Regardless of whether any such statements are specifically identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statements in the Office Action.

SOURCE REGION AND DRAIN REGION.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the requirement of a new title.

Amendments to the Drawings

As requested by the Examiner, Applicant has labeled Figures 1-3 “Prior Art.” The changes to Figures 1-3 are indicated on the attached drawing Replacement Sheets 1/2 and 2/2 attached hereto. Applicant requests that these replacement sheets be made of official record. If the drawings are not in full compliance with the pertinent statutes and regulations, please advise the undersigned.

Objections to Claims 4 and 5

The Examiner objected to claim 4 because “‘if’ before ‘an angle’ needs to be deleted” (Office Action at 3). In response, Applicant has cancelled claim 4 and added the limitations of claim 4 into independent claim 1. In doing so, Applicant has omitted the objected to word “if.” Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to cancelled claim 4. The Examiner also objected to claim 5 because “the words ‘even if’ before ‘a facet’ needs to be deleted” (Office Action at 3). Applicant has deleted the objected to phrase and amended claim 5 to improve readability. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 5.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Masato* and the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Masato* in view of *Hokazono*. First, the rejection of claim 7 is moot because Applicant has cancelled claim 7. In order expedite prosecution of this application, however, Applicant has amended claim 1 by incorporating subject matter of objected to claim 4.

In addition, objected to claim 8 has been placed in independent form by incorporating subject matter of claim 7, from which claim 8 directly depends, and original claim 1, from which claim 8 indirectly depends. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are deemed allowable.

Moreover, Applicant has added new claims 21-25 which depend from claim 8 and correspond to claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9, respectively. Claims 21-25 are therefore also deemed allowable. Finally, Applicant has also amended claims 2, 3, and 5 solely to improve readability.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


If there are any remaining issues or misunderstandings, Applicant requests the Examiner telephone the undersigned representative to discuss them.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 21, 2006

By: 
Patrick L. Miller
Reg. No. 57,502
direct telephone number (202) 408-6062

Attachments (2): Drawing Replacement Sheets 1/2 and 2/2